

**MI Child Support Formula - (no subject)**

---

**From:** <Scott67z@aol.com>  
**To:** <MCSF@courts.mi.gov>  
**Date:** 7/1/2003 2:05 PM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

---

I am writing to comment on proposed changes to administrative court rules relating to the Friend of the Court (Specifically: Wayne County FOC) ADM 2003-22: 3 Shared Economic Responsibility section (3.05). There are several issues that I feel warrant strong consideration in regards to any changes made to this section. First, I feel that the determination by the committee that overnite stays of a child, as a sole issue, establishes financial burdens not experienced during other parenting time is a fundamentally erroneous conclusion. In my own particular case I have my child EVERY Tuesday and Thursday from 4:15pm to 7:45pm and EVERY OTHER weekend from 4:15pm Friday to 7:45pm Sunday. This parenting time schedule puts my child in my care almost exactly the same amount of time that she spends with her mother. Prior to myself recently being layed-off both of us worked during the day and so our child was with a daycare provider. The result of this being that although my child's mother has physical custody the only difference in the time spent with our child is the short period before her bedtime and while she is sleeping. While I do agree that this creates an additional parenting responsibility, I do not agree that it creates anything close to an added or substantial financial responsibility not shared by the non-custodial parent. Additionally, there have been no allowances for this in the FOC's determination of my child support amount. I incur practically identical expenses for everything. I have to provide a home, clothing, food, toys, furniture and other things that represent an equal financial responsibility just as her mother does. Yet, by the FOC guidelines I must pay a full amount of child support, same as if I never saw my child ( didn't have to maintain a home, buy clothing, food, toys, furniture, etc,.). My situation has not fit the guidelines for shared economic responsibility. I must admit it doesn't FEEL like shared economic responsibility either. In our mutual parenting time agreement I do eighty percent ( 80% ) of the driving as well, incurring that extra expense too. I have my child additionally for 3 non-consecutive weeks each year and an equal distribution of school breaks and also alternating Holidays. If I understand correctly, I did not fit the guidelines before these proposals and I will not fit the guidelines for shared economic responsibility if these proposals are adopted due to the retroactive language. It is not clear to me why the advisory committee would recommend lowering the threshold to 52 overnites in an attempt to make support guidelines more fair and then seek to exclude those individuals who sought fairness in parenting time from the beginning. I always thought that the courts responsibility was to interpret fairness in the laws created by our legislative branch of government, not to engage in lawmaking itself and especially not for the purpose of limiting who should be treated more fairly simply to reduce case loads. FOCUS ON FAIRNESS. ENVISION EQUALITY. Let's not continue to make the mistake of correcting past inequalities by creating a new inequality.

Sincerely,

Scott Zahler